

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of June 5, 2007, in which claims 1-8, 13-20 and 23-28 are rejected and claims 9-12, 21 and 22 are objected to. Claims 1, 10-13, 22-24 and 26-28 have been amended to more clearly describe the invention as claimed. Claims 9, 21 and 25 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 9, now canceled. Based on the statement in the Office Action that claim 9 was allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10-12 are dependent on claim 1 and recite further important aspects of the invention. Thus, claims 2-8 and 10-12 patentably define over the prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 1. Also, claim 10 has been amended to cure the antecedent basis problem cited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-8 and 10-12 is requested.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 21, now canceled. Based on the statement in the Office Action that claim 21 was allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 13, Applicants submit that claim 13 is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 13 is requested.

Claims 14-20 and 22 are dependent on claim 13 and recite further important aspects of the invention. Thus, claims 14-20 and 22 patentably define over the prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 13. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-20 and 22 is requested.

Claims 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa in view of Lambertson. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 23 has been amended to include a controller which is external of the micro-fluid ejecting device and in communication with the nonvolatile programmable memory matrix.

Neither of the cited references describe or suggest an external controller communicating with a nonvolatile programmable memory matrix in a micro-fluid ejecting

device as now required by claim 23. Furukawa discloses a printhead with non-volatile memory, but there is no suggestion that the memory communicates with a printer controller or any other controller external to the printhead. Lambertson discloses programmable nonvolatile memory devices, but not an external controller communicating with such memory devices in a micro-fluid ejecting device.

Therefore, claim 23 as amended patentably defines over Furukawa in view of Lambertson. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 23 is requested.

Claims 24 and 26-28 are dependent on claim 23 and recite further important aspects of the invention. Applicants note that the Office Action did not provide an explanation for the obviousness rejection of claim 24, and did not point to any discussion of an external controller in either of the cited references. In any event, Applicants submit that claims 24 and 26-28 patentably define over the prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 23. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 24 and 26-28 is requested.


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the above-identified patent application is in a condition for the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Such action by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension, along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, be charged to our Deposit Account No. 12-2355.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:



Mark P. Crockett

Registration No. 47,507

Date: September 4, 2007

P.O. Box 1871

Knoxville, Tennessee 37901

(865) 546-4305